REMARKS

This application pertains to a novel flame-retardant pressure-sensitive adhesive, having improved bond strength.

Claims 1-32 are pending.

The claims have been amended to clarify that the resin component recited is a tackifying resin. Support is found at page 6, line 19.

Claims 7-12, 18, 23, 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S. C. 112, second paragraph, because the Examiner views the terms "substituted" and "derivative" as rendering the claims unclear. The claims have now been amended to delete such terms, except in those cases where specific substituents are recited.

The rejection of claims 7-12, 18, 23, 30 under 35 U.S. C. 112, second paragraph should therefore now be withdrawn.

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-13, 18-27, 31 and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Parsons (US 5,851,663).

The Examiner asks clarification of Applicants' statement that their composition has good results without being combined with such second compounds. If the Examiner will refer to the paragraph bridging pages 4 and 5 of Applicants' response of

January 24, 2007, she will see that Applicants' pointed out that Parsons required the uses of Ammonium Phosphate **together with another compound, such as a nitrogen containing oligomer**. Applicants' statement pointed out that Applicants' compositions did not need a second compound, such as Parsons does. It is hoped that this clarifies the statement, but if further clarification is required, please advise the undersigned accordingly.

Applicants' claims require:

(a) at least one acrylate adhesive component,
(b) at least one ammonium polyphosphate component and
(c) at least one tackifying resin component.

Nowhere does Parsons teach or suggest such a combination and, in fact, actually teaches away from such a combination.

At column 4, lines 13 - 22, Parsons teaches a rubber resin based pressure sensitive adhesive. This is not a "resin" , and certainly not a "tackifying resin", but rather a pressure sensitive adhesive made from a rubber resin. This rubber resin based pressure sensitive adhesive can be combined with a tackifying resin (col. 4, line 18). However, the pressure-sensitive adhesive is not an acrylate adhesive, such as is required in Applicants' claims. Clearly, this does not teach or suggest Applicants' composition.

At column 4, lines 37 - 51, Parsons does teach an acrylic adhesive, but specifically teaches that **no additional tackifying resin is required** (lines 45-46).

Parsons therefore teaches not to use a tackifying resin with an acrylate adhesive. Applicants' claims require that a tackifying resin be used with the acrylate adhesive. Therefore, Parsons cannot possibly teach or suggest Applicants' composition and, in fact, teaches away from it.

The rejection of claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-13, 18-27, 31 and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Parsons (US 5,851,663) should therefore be withdrawn.

Claims 1-15, 17, 19 and 21-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C.102(a or e) as anticipated by Sakurai (US 6,893,583 or US 2002/0193487).

The Sakurai reference(s) is/are concerned with a flame-retardant curable resin composition.

Nowhere, however, do the Sakurai references teach or suggest anything at all about a combination of an acrylate adhesive component with a tackifying resin and a flame retardant. The so-called "resins" that the Examiner points to at column 5 are not tackifying resins, but rather are elastomers added to improve impact resistance.

In the absence of some teaching or suggestion of a combination of an acrylate adhesive, a tackifying resin and ammonium polyphosphate, the Sakurai reference(s) cannot be seen as rendering Applicants' claims anticipated, and the rejection of claims 1-15, 17, 19 and 21-29 under 35 U.S.C.102(a or e) as anticipated by Sakurai (US 6,893,583 or US 2002/0193487) should be withdrawn.

Finally, claims 1-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Parsons (US 5,851,663) or Sakuari (US 6,893,583 or US 2002/0193487) in view of Nishumura (US 2005/0227065). The Examiner cites Nishumura for a teaching of "other monomers" of acrylates, photoinintiators and specific molecular weights.

No "other monomers" of acrylates, photoinintiators or specific molecular weights could possibly overcome the differences shown above between the disclosure of the primary references and subject-matter of Applicants' claims.

The rejection of claims 1-32 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Parsons (US 5,851,663) or Sakuari (US 6,893,583 or US 2002/0193487) in view of Nishumura (US 2005/0227065) should therefore now be withdrawn.

Finally, the Examiner inquires why Applicants' submitted a list of patents with their response of January 24, 2007. If the Examiner will turn to the third paragraph on page 4 of that response, she will see that Applicants explained that the attached lists of patents are lists of patents where the expressions "Norrish I" and "Norrish II" are recited. This list was submitted just to provide evidence that these terms are known in the art.

In view of the present amendments and remarks, it is believed that claims 1 – 32 are now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of said claims by the Examiner is respectfully requested, and the allowance thereof is courteously solicited. Should the Examiner not deem the present amendment and remarks to place the instant claims in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that this Amendment Under Rule

116 be entered for the purpose of placing the prosecution record in better condition for appeal.

CONDITIONAL PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

If any extension of time for this response is required, Appellants request that this be considered a petition therefor. Please charge the required petition fee to Deposit Account No. 14-1263.

ADDITIONAL FEE

Please charge any insufficiency of fee or credit any excess to Deposit Account No. 14-1263.

Respectfully submitted,
NORRIS, McLAUGHLIN & MARCUS, P.A.

By /s/William C. Gerstenzang/
William C. Gerstenzang
Reg. No. 27,552

WCG/tmh
875 Third Avenue- 18th Floor
New York, New York 10022
(212) 808-0700